1 2 3 4	BRUCE A. HARLAND, Bar No. 230477 WEINBERG, ROGER & ROSENFELD A Professional Corporation 1001 Marina Village Parkway, Suite 200 Alameda, California 94501-1091 Telephone 510.337.1001 Fax 510.337.1023		
5	Attorneys for Intervenor/Incumbent SEIU, UHW – West		
6	SEIO, OHW – West		
7	UNITED STAT	ES OF AMERIC	CA
8	NATIONAL LABOR	RELATIONS E	BOARD
9	WAIGED FOLDINATION HEAT THE DEAD	\ C \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	40 D.C. 5554
10	KAISER FOUNDATION HEALTH PLAN, INC.; KAISER FOUNDATION HOSPITALS; SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA PERMANENTE) Case No.	32-RC-5774
11	MEDICAL GROUP; THE PERMANENTE MEDICAL GROUP, INC.,	`	- WEST'S EXCEPTIONS
12		JUDGE'S RE	MINISTRATIVE LAW
13	Employer, and	RECOMMEN OBJECTION	NDATIONS ON IS
14)	
15	NATIONAL UNION OF HEALTHCARE WORKERS,))	
16	Petitioner,))	
17	and))	
18	SERVICE EMPLOYEES INTERNATIONAL UNION, UNITED HEALTHCARE WORKERS	,))	
19	- WEST))	
20	Intervenor/Incumbent.))	
21)	
22			
23	Intervenor and Incumbent, Service Emplo	yees Internation	al Union, United Healthcare
24	Workers – West (the "Union" or "UHW") takes t	he following ex	ceptions to the Administrative
25	Law Judge's ("ALJ's") Report and Recommendations on Objections ("Report") issued on July 19,		
26	2011 in the above-referenced case. A copy of the	ALJ's Report is	s attached as Exhibit "A".
27	///	•	
28 weinberg, roger &			
ROSENFELD A Professional Corporation 1001 Marina Village Parkway Suite 200 Alameda, CA 94501-1091 510.337.1001	Kaiser Foundation H NLRB Case N SEIU-UHW – West's Exceptions to the Administrative I	o. 32-RC-5774	•

1	Number	Reference to Decision	Exception Taken
2	1.	Page 2	The ALJ's finding that the critical period was June 29, 2010
3	1.	Tage 2	through October 4, 2010. The critical period in the instant matter was actually June 29, 2010 through November 8, 2010.
4 5			See Reg'l Dir's Supp. Dec. & Notice of Hearing ("RD's Supp. Dec.") at p. 2.
6	2.	Page 6	The ALJ's finding that the "[b]allots in the MSW unit [were]
7		- 100	tallied" on October 10, 2010. The ballots were, in fact, tallied on November 10, 2010. See RD's Supp. Dec. at Appendix A,
8			p. 1.
9	3.	Page 8 & fn. 13	The ALJ's statement that "[t]he parties stipulated that [Cleante] Stain's testimony taken in an earlier hearing in Case 32-RC-2775 be incorporated herein." The correct case number of the
11			earlier hearing is 32-RC-5775.
12	4.	Page 8	The ALJ's finding that Stain's suggested to MSW unit
13			employees that they "ask themselves it [sic] they could afford to live without the two percent [wage increase]."
14	5.	Page 8	The ALJ's finding that Stain told MSW unit employees "that
15 16		- 350	selecting NUHW might put at risk the three percent raise scheduled for October [2010] and that the SoCal-pro units had been told that they would not get the PSP bonus in March
17			because they were not a part of the Coalition."
18	6.	Page 8	The ALJ's conclusion that "[i]t is reasonable to infer that Stain
19 20			delivered essentially the same message to the MSW unit employees in Oakland," especially since, as the ALJ concedes, "[i]t is not clear from Stain's testimony what, specifically she told MSW unit employees."
21			
22	7.	Page 8	The ALJ's failure to determine what, if anything, Stain told MSW unit employees, and to how many MSW unit employees
23			Stain spoke with during the critical period.
24	8.	Page 11	The ALJ's conclusion that the "Intervenor's campaign
25			repeatedly correlated Kaiser ULPs the MSW unit, emphasizing the benefit risk the unlawful conduct denoted for employees who selected NUHW as their representative."
26			•
27	9.	Page 11	The ALJ's framing of the "crucial question" as "whether by emphasizing and parallelizing Kaiser's ULPs, Intervenor's
28 ER &		Vai	- 2 - iser Foundation Health Plan, Inc. et al.,
oration kway		Kui	NLRB Case No. 32-RC-5774

1			campaign unfairly interfered with MSW-unit employee's election choice."
2			
3	10.	Page 11	The ALJ's framing of the issue, with respect to PSP bonuses, as
4		1450 11	"whether pronouncements that MSW unit employees would be ineligible for PSP incentive bonuses if they selected NUHW
5		料	interfered with the election."
6 7	11.	Page 11	The ALJ's conclusion that "[t]he accuracy and good-faith of Intervenor's reporting is not dispositive of the issues."
8 9 10	12.	Page 11	The ALJ's conclusion that the "Board applies an objective standard when evaluating whether statements [made by labor organizations] interfere with free election choice"
11	13.	Page 11	The All Pareliance on S.T. A.D. Inc. 247 NII DD 92 (2006) Services
12	13.	rage II	The ALJ's reliance on S.T.A.R., Inc., 347 NLRB 82 (2006) for the proposition that the Board applies an objective standard for statements made during an election campaign involving a rival
13			labor organization. In S.T.A.R., the Board held that a labor organization engages in objectionable conduct based on an
14			ambiguous brochure that was "reasonably susceptible to an interpretation" that the Union was offering to waive initiation
15			fees for only those employees who supported the Union before the election. 347 NLRB at 83-84. S.T.A.R. is not analogous to the instant matter.
16			•
17 18	14.	Page 11	The ALJ's failure to consider the fact that at the time of the election, neither an ALJ, the NLRB, or a court, had found that Kaiser's conduct was unlawful.
19			
20	15.	Page 11	The ALJ's assumption that Intervenor knew, or should have known, that Kaiser's behavior and conduct with respect to the Southern California Professional units was unlawful, even
21	z ²		though, as the ALJ notes, Intervenor "had no control over or involvement in Kaiser's ULP and could not control
22			Kaiser's future actions regarding MSW unit benefits."
23	16.	Page 11	The ALJ's finding that "[h]owever factually accurate
24		·	Intervenor's statements may have been, Intervenor's campaign specifically linked its predictions or risk warnings to existing
25			and ongoing Kaiser ULPs not to future lawful behavior." This finding, again, fails to take into account that, during the critical
26			period, neither an ALJ, the NLRB or a court had found that Kaiser had engaged in unlawful conduct in the Southern
27			California Professional unit. This, of course, would have required Intervenor to possess a crystal ball to determine
28 ER &		v	- 3 -
oration		Ka	iser Foundation Health Plan, Inc. et al.,

WEINBERG, ROCER & ROSENFELD

A Professional Corporation
1001 Marina Village Parkway
Suite 200
Alameda, CA 94501-1091
510.337.1001

1 2		whether or not the employer's conduct, which it had not control over or involvement in, would at some point – which could be years from the alleged conduct – be found to be unlawful.
3		
4	17. Page 11	The ALJ's finding that Intervenor's focus on Kaiser's conduct in the Southern California Professional unit and "its objective
5		effect [which] was to warn employees that they jeopardized monetary benefits if they changed representatives" constituted objectionable conduct.
6		
7	18. Page 11	The ALJ's finding that "[i]n Intervenor's communications about potential benefit losses, Kaiser's ULPs figured as
8		concrete, menacing reminders that Kaiser had unilaterally withheld benefits from employees in the SoCal-pro units when
9		they chose to be represented by NUHW," even though, as the ALJ notes, Intervenor "had no control over or involvement in Kaiser's ULP and could not control Kaiser's future actions
11		regarding statewide unit benefits."
12	19. Page 11	The ALJ's conclusion that "[v]iewed objectively, Intervenor's
13		statements presented an obvious cause and effect: SoCal-pro units voted for NUHW; Kaiser withdrew certain of their
14	*	established benefits."
15	20. Page 11	The ALJ's conclusion that "Intervenor's communications
16		invited, if not provoked, the obvious inference that Kaiser's conduct would be repeated as to MSW unit benefits if
17		employees voted for Petitioner," even though, as the ALJ notes, Intervenor "had no control over or involvement in Kaiser's ULP and could not control Kaiser's future actions
18		regarding statewide unit benefits."
19	21 Page 12	TILL AT TO COMPANY 1 1 19 1 1 1 1
20	21. Page 12	The ALJ's reference to "USW unit employees," which should have referenced "UHW unit employees."
21	22. Page 12	The ALJ's conclusion that "the very interconnection of
22		unlawful conduct with campaign rhetoric is the problem" in the instant matter. This, of course, improperly assumes that
23 24		Intervenor knew, or should have known, that Kaiser's conduct was unlawful, even though during the critical period there was no such finding.
25		
26	23. Page 12	The ALJ's finding that "Intervenor's messages rested on coercive bedrock, i.e., the existence of unremedied ULPs that
27	25	clearly paralleled the MSW employee's situation." This, of course, improperly assumes that Intervenor knew, or should
28	-	have known, that Kaiser's conduct was unlawful, even though
WEINBERG, ROGER & ROSENFELD A Professional Corporation		- 4 - Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc. et al.,
1001 Marina Village Parkway Suite 200 Alameda, CA 94501-1091	oeniimu w.a.e	NLRB Case No. 32-RC-5774
510.337.1001	SEIU-UHW – West's Exce	eptions to the Administrative Law Judge's Report and Recommendations on Objections

1			during the critical period there was no such finding.
2			
3	24.	Page 12	The AI I'm finding that the WACTV and leave to the '
4	24.	Page 12	The ALJ's finding that the "MSW employee's situation" "clearly paralleled" the Southern California Professional units
5			situation. This finding fails to take into consideration and ignores three undisputed facts that were entered into the record
6			as stipulations: 1) that employees in the MSW unit received their two percent PSP in March, 2010, for the period of 2009."
7			(Tr. 150:20-24); and 2) that "employees in the MSW unit received the three percent wage increase [on] October [15],
8			2010; and 3) that employees in the MSW unit received this wage increase prior to the commencement of the voting period. (Tr. 150:9-13).
9			(11. 150.9-15).
10	25.	Page 12	The AI I's finding that "Ivilianced abjectively, the facts
11	25.	1 age 12	The ALJ's finding that "[v]iewed objectively, the facts – broadcast widely during the critical period – must have
12			signified to MSW unit employees the likelihood that Kaiser would, consistent with continuing misconduct, unlawfully eliminate certain MSW unit benefits if employees chose
13			NUHW." This, once again, improperly assumes that Intervenor knew, or should have known, that Kaiser's conduct was
14	,		unlawful, even though during the critical period there was no such finding.
15			Such Intellig.
16	26.	Page 12	The ALJ's conclusion that "the known existence of the facts had, at the very least, the tendency to interfere with employees'
17			freedom of choice." The ALJ's conclusion, among other things, assumes that during the critical period it was a "fact"
18			that Kaiser had unlawfully withheld wages and benefits from the Southern California Professional unit; this is not an accurate
19			statement of the record.
20	27.	Page 12 & fn. 19	The ALJ's reliance upon Taylor Wharton Div. Harsco Corp.,
21		J	336 NLRB 157 (2001) as legal support for the proposition that Intervenor's dissemination of underlying facts interfered with
22			employee free choice, even though, as the ALJ notes, Intervenor "had no control over or involvement in Kaiser's
23			ULP and could not control Kaiser's future actions regarding statewide unit benefits."
24			- -
25	28.	Page 12 & fn. 19	The ALJ's reliance upon <i>Taylor Wharton Div. Harsco Corp.</i> , 336 NLRB 157 (2001) for legal support, despite the fact that
26			the Board's decision in <i>Taylor Wharton</i> is distinguishable from the facts in the instant matter. In <i>Taylor Wharton</i> , the employer
27			distributed a cartoon which portrayed a Union organizer announcing that the Company had closed. The Board held that
28 ger &			- 5 -
oration arkway			Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc. et al., NLRB Case No. 32-RC-5774

WEINBERG, ROGER ROSENFELD
A Professional Corporation 1001 Marina Village Parkway Suite 200
Alamoda, CA 94501-1091
510.337.1001

1			because the cartoon "was not based on objective fact," it constituted "an unsupported prediction of strikes and plant
2			closure should employees select the Union as their bargaining representative." In addition, the election was extremely close,
3			with an election margin of only one vote.
4	29.	Page 12	The ALJ's conclusion that Judge Schmidt's reasoning could be
5			applied to "[p]rospective curtailment of PSP incentive bonuses to employees in SoCal pro-units," even though that issue was
6 7			not litigated in So. Cal. Permanente Med. Group, 356 NLRB No. 106 (2011) and Judge Schmidt, as the ALJ notes, did not address it in his decision.
8			
9	30.	Page 12	The ALJ's conclusion that Intervenor's "dissemination of the underlying facts had, at the very least, the tendency to interfere
10			with the employee's freedom of choice," even though, as the ALJ notes, Intervenor "had no control over or involvement in
11			Kaiser's ULP and could not control Kaiser's future actions regarding statewide unit benefits."
12	21	D 10	
13	31.	Page 12	The ALJ's determination that Kaiser unlawfully withheld the PSP incentive bonus from the SoCal pro units or unlawfully
14			prospectively curtailed it, even though no unfair labor practice charge to Intervenor's knowledge has been filed over that issue.
15	32.	Page 12	The ALJ's adjudication of an unfair labor practice allegation
16		1 1150 12	involving Kaiser's prospective curtailment of PSP incentive bonuses to employees in the SoCal-pro units.
17			
18	33.	Page 12	The ALJ's finding that "the granting of incentive bonuses constituted a term and condition of employment that Kaiser
19	•		was required to maintain and continue in substance if not in specific form, unless altered through collective bargaining."
20	34.	Page 12	The ALJ's resolution of an issue – the granting of incentive
21			bonuses – which should have been litigated in an unfair labor practice proceeding.
22	2.5	D 10	
23	35.	Page 12	The ALJ's finding that the "Intervenor's widely disseminated warnings that the PSP incentive bonuses <i>could</i> be lost were
24 25			erroneous since Kaiser's practice of granting incentive bonuses was subject to change only through collective bargaining." (Emphasis added).
26			
27	36.	Page 12	The ALJ's failure to recognize any scenario by which employees lost their PSP incentive bonuses after voting for
28			NUHW because it was changed through the collective
GER & D poration		Kai	- 6 - ser Foundation Health Plan, Inc. et al.,
arkway		1200	NLRB Case No. 32-RC-5774

	!		
1			bargaining process – whether by agreement or impasse.
2			
3	37.	Page 12	The ALJ's reliance on "warnings by Kaiser's President Chu,
4		1 50 1-2	who informed employees that only members of coalition unions were guaranteed PSP incentive bonuses," to support a
5 6			finding that Intervenor engaged in objectionable conduct. Chu is not an agent of Intervenor.
	38.	Page 12	
7 8	36.	Page 12	The ALJ's finding that "Intervenor's repeated forewarnings that representational change <i>might</i> endanger PSP incentive bonuses" constituted objectionable conduct. (Emphasis added).
9	20	D 10	
10	39.	Page 12	The ALJ's finding that Intervenor widely disseminated a warning that PSP incentive bonuses <i>would not</i> – rather than <i>may not</i> – survive a change if bargaining representative.
11			*
12	40.	Page 12	The ALJ's conclusion that "widely disseminated warning that the PSP incentive bonuses would not survive a change of
13			representative must also have tended to interfere with employee's freedom of choice."
14			
15	41.	Page 12 & fn. 19	The ALJ's reliance upon <i>Vegas Village Shopping Corporation</i> , 229 NLRB 279 (1997) as legal support for the proposition that
16 17			Intervenor's dissemination of underlying facts interfered with employee free choice, even though, as the ALJ notes, Intervenor "had no control over or involvement in Kaiser's
18			ULP and could not control Kaiser's future actions regarding statewide unit benefits." In Vegas Village, during an
19			election in two separate bargaining units of the same employer, involving the same labor organization, the employer engaged in
20			certain unfair labor practices in one unit. The Board set aside the elections in the both units, even though the unfair labor
21			practices occurred in only one of the units, because the employer's "unlawful conduct was likely to have a coercive
22			impact on employees in both units in the Las Vegas area." 229 NLRB at 280. Here, the elections in the MSW unit and
23			Southern California Professional units took place at different times – approximately 10 months apart – and did not occur in
24			the same geographical area but, in fact, occurred hundreds of miles apart from each other.
25			
26	42.	Page 13	The ALJ's conclusion that "Petitioner's counter-campaign could not, when weighed against pending litigation of
27			indeterminate outcome and unremedied ULPs, be reasonably expected to persuade voters that Intervenor's warnings were
28 ger &			-7-
D poration Parkway		K	Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc. et al., NLRB Case No. 32-RC-5774

WEINBERG, ROGER & ROSENFELD A Professional Corporatio 1001 Marina Village Parkway Suite 200 Alameda, CA 94501-1091 510.337.1001

	İ		
1			mere propaganda."
2			
3	43.	Page 13	The ALJ's conclusion that she must draw the "unavoidable
4 5		- 1.00	inference that MSW unit employees voted with objectively reasonable, albeit inaccurate and ULP-induced, apprehensions that a vote for Petitioner was a vote for benefit reduction."
6			
7 T	44.	Page 13	The ALJ's finding that "Intervenor widely disseminated, consistent warnings that Kaiser was likely to repeat its 2009 unlawful conduct in the MSW unit if unit employees selected
8			Petitioner as their collective bargaining representative tended to stoke unwarranted and coerced voter fears," even though, as the
9			ALJ notes, Intervenor "had no control over or involvement in Kaiser's ULP and could not control Kaiser's future actions regarding statewide unit benefits."
11			
12	45.	Page 13	The ALJ's finding that "Intervenor's conduct, viewed
13			objectively, had a reasonable tendency to interfere with unit employees' free and uncoerced choice in the election."
14	46.	Page 13	The ALJ's recommendation "that Objection Nos. 2, 3, 4, and 6
15		3	in the circumstances described in Objection 1, be sustained."
16	47.	Page 13	The ALJ's recommendation that the election results be set aside
17			and new election be held.
18	48.	Pages 13-14	The ALJ's recommendation that a <i>Lufkin</i> notice be issued in
19			this matter, especially given that Petitioner did not request such a notice.
20	49.	Page 14	The AII's recommendation that the Indianation and
21	77.	1 age 14	The ALJ's recommendation that the <i>Lufkin</i> notice contain a reference to "in the circumstances of unfair labor practices committed by Kaiser Foundation Hospitals and Southern
22			California Permanente Medical Group among the professional collective bargaining units of Kaiser employees in Southern
23			California" as it deviates from standard <i>Lufkin</i> notice.
24 25	50.	Passim	The ALJ's failure to follow the Board's holding in <i>Midland</i>
26			National Life Ins. Co., 263 NLRB 127 (1982).
27	51.	Passim	The ALJ's failure to distinguish – let alone address and follow
			- Air La Carte, 284 NLRB 471 (1987) from the facts of this case.
28 ger & d		Vai	- 8 - ser Foundation Health Plan, Inc. et al.,
poration arkway		1144	NLRB Case No. 32-RC-5774

WEINBERG, ROGER &
ROSENFELD
A Professional Corporatio
1001 Marina Village Parkway
Suite 200
Alameda, CA 94501-1091
510.337.1001

52.	Passim	The ALJ's failure to infer that if the NLRB was uncertain as to
	-	whether or not Kaiser's conduct with respect to the Southern California Professional unit was unlawful, then Intervenor,
		which was not a party to the Southern California dispute, would have no basis to conclude that Kaiser's conduct was unlawful.
53.	Passim	The ALJ's failure to consider, or even address, the fact that employees in the IBHS and Optical units, which were subject
		to the same campaign statement by Intervenor, voted for Petitioner; and, in the case, of IBHS, by a substantial margin.
		(See Tr. 40:17-23; 41:4-9; Intervenor's Exhs. 5 and 6).
54.	Passim	The ALJ's reliance upon an unfair labor practice charge
		committed by the employer that occurred outside of the critical period as grounds for recommending that the election be set
		aside.
55.	Passim	The ALJ's failure to consider the fact that the Petitioner failed
		to ask for the election to be blocked but, instead, chose to proceed to an election.
Dated: A	11011st 18 2011	
Duicu. 12	.ugust 10, 2011	WEINBERG, ROGER & ROSENFELD
		A Professional Corporation
		By: Shee A. Harland
		BRUCE A. HARLAND Attorneys for Intervenor/Incumbent
1/630786		
		- 9 -
	53. 54.	53. Passim 54. Passim 55. Passim Dated: August 18, 2011

WEINBERG, ROGER & ROSENFELD
A Professional Corporation 1001 Marina Village Parkway Suite 200
Alameda, CA 94501-1091 510.337.1001

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BEFORE THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD DIVISION OF JUDGES

THE PERMANENTE MEDICAL GROUP, INC. and KAISER FOUNDATION HOSPITALS

Employers

and

NATIONAL UNION OF HEALTHCARE WORKERS
Petitioner

Case 32-RC-5774

and

SEIU-UHW (SERVICE EMPLOYEES INTERNATIONAL UNION, UNITED HEALTHCARE WORKERS - WEST)

Intervenor

For the Petitioner: Florice Orea Hoffman, Atty., Orange, CA. For the Intervenor: Bruce A. Harland, Atty., Weinberg, Roger & Rosenfeld, Alameda, CA.

For the Employers: Ronald E. Goldman, Atty., Kaiser Permanente, Oakland, CA; Michael R. Lindsay, Atty., Nixon Peabody, LLP, Los Angeles, CA.

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON OBJECTIONS

LANA PARKE, Administrative Law Judge. The National Union of Healthcare Workers (Petitioner or NUHW) filed a petition on June 29, 2010¹ seeking representation of employees of The Permanente Medical Group, Inc. and Kaiser Foundation Hospitals (Employers)² in a medical social workers bargaining unit (MSW unit) then, and currently, represented by Service Employees International Union, United Healthcare Workers – West (Intervenor or SEIU-UHW). The Regional Director of Region 32 of the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB or Board) issued his Decision and Direction of Election on September 7. An election by mail ballot was conducted between October 18 and November 8 in the MSW unit described below, the employees of which were located in 37 separate Kaiser facilities throughout the Employers' Northern California region:

¹ All dates refer to 2010 unless otherwise indicated.

² Numerous entities make up the Kaiser Permanente enterprise of which the Employers are two. Herein, the national enterprise is referred to as Kaiser Permanente; unless separate designation is necessary, other groupings within Kaiser Permanente, aside from the Employers, are referred to as Kaiser.

All full-time and regular part-time medical social workers employed by the Employers in positions covered by the collective bargaining agreement between the Employers and SEIU-UHW effective October 1, 2005, including Medical Social Worker I, Medical Social Worker II, and Medical Social Worker III; excluding any medical social worker assigned to be Director of Social Services at any of the Employers' facilities or to whom the Employers have given the authority to hire, promote, discipline, discharge, or otherwise change status or to effectively recommend such action, all employees represented by other unions, confidential employees, guards, and supervisors as defined in the National Labor Relations Act.

The election resulted in the following final tally of ballots:

15	Approximate number of eligible voters Number of void ballots	378
	Number of votes cast for NUHW	
	Number of votes cast for NEITHER	
	Number of votes cast for SEIU - UHW	
20	Number of valid votes counted	289
	Number, of challenged ballots	3
	Valid votes counted plus challenged ballots	292

Following the election, Petitioner filed timely objections to the election on November 17.
On February 23, 2011, the Regional Director issued his Supplemental Decision and Notice of Hearing (decision on objections), recommending that Petitioner's Objections 5 and 7-71 be overruled in their entirety and setting for hearing, as limited in the decision, Objections 1-4 and 6. Hearing on those objections was held in Oakland, California on May 2 and 3, 2011.

Unless otherwise explained, findings of fact herein are based on party admissions, stipulations, uncontroverted relevant testimony, and findings of fact made by Administrative Law Judge William L. Schmidt in Case 21-CA-39296 and adopted by the Board (with minor modification of unit description) at *Southern California Permanente Medical Group; and Kaiser Foundation Hospitals*, 356 NLRB No.106 (2011). On the entire record and after considering the briefs filed by Petitioner, Intervenor, and Employers, I find the following events occurred in the circumstances described during the critical period.

Findings of Fact and Discussion

A. Legal Overview

The critical period during which conduct allegedly affecting the results of a representation election must be examined "commences at the filing of the representation petition and extends through the election." *E.L.C. Electric, Inc.*, 344 NLRB 1200, 1201 fn. 6 (2005). Here, the critical period is June 29 through October 4.

40

45

5

The Board does not lightly set aside representation elections.³ "There is a strong presumption that ballots cast under specific NLRB procedural safeguards reflect the true desires of the employees." *NLRB v. Hood Furniture Mfg. Co.*, 941 F.2d 325, 328 (5th Cir. 1991). The burden of proving a Board-supervised election should be set aside is a "heavy one." The burden is even heavier where the vote margin is large." *Trump Plaza Associates*, 352 NLRB 628, 629-30 (citing Avis Rent-A-Car System, 280 NLRB 580, 581-582 (1986)). The objecting party must show that objectionable conduct affected employees in the voting unit. Avante at Boca Raton, Inc., 323 NLRB 555, 560 (1997) (overruling employer's objection where no evidence unit employees knew of alleged coercive incident).

10

15

5

As the objecting party, the Petitioner has the burden of proving interference with the election. See *Jensen Pre-Cast*, 290 NLRB 547 (1988). The test, applied objectively, is whether election conduct has the tendency to interfere with employees' freedom of choice.⁵ Petitioner must show the conduct in question had a reasonable tendency to interfere with employees' free and uncoerced choice in the election to such an extent that it materially affected the results of the election.⁶

B. Petitioner's Objections Nos. 1 through 4 and 6

20

(1) The employer, by its agents, violated Section 8(a)(1) and Section 8(a)(5) by committing unlawful unilateral changes by withholding and/or cancelling scheduled annual across-the-board raises, tuition-reimbursement benefits, and union-steward training programs for employees represented by NUHW in other units.⁷

25

(2) The SEIU, by its agents, widely disseminated to employees the threat that if NUHW won this election, the employer would not pay contractually bargained-for wage increases including but not limited to threats that the employer would not provide employees with an upcoming salary increase due in or around October 2010.

30

(3) The SEIU, by its agents, widely disseminated to employees the threat that if NUHW won this election, the employer would not pay an already bargained-for Performance Sharing Program (PSP) bonus.

35

(4) The SEIU, by its agents, widely disseminated to employees the threat that if NUHW won the election that they would lose the benefits of the Coalition of Kaiser Permanente Unions and the benefits of the National Agreements because SEIU would forever bar NUHW participation in such bargaining.

40

⁴ Kux Mfg. Co. v. NLRB, 890 F.2d 804, 808 (6th Cir. 1989) (quoting Harlan #4 Coal Co. v. NLRB, 490 F.2d 117, 120 (6th Cir.), cert. denied 416 U.S. 986 (1974).

45

50

⁵ Taylor Wharton Division, 336 NLRB 157, 158 (2001); Cedars-Sinai Medical Center, 342 NLRB 596 (2004); Baja's Place, 268 NLRB 868 (1984).

⁶ Madison Square Garden Ct., LLC, 350 NLRB 117, 119 (2007) (internal quotations and citations omitted); Quest International, 338 NLRB 856, 857 (2003).

⁷ The Regional Director overruled the second part of Objection No. 1: "[the employers violated Section 8(a)(1) and (5) of the Act by] threatening similar reprisal and/or loss of benefits if NUHW won in this unit."

³ Quest International, 338 NLRB 856 (2003); Safeway, Inc., 338 NLRB 525 (2002); NLRB v. Hood Furniture Mfg. Co., 941 F.2d 325, 328 (5th Cir. 1991) (citing NLRB v. Monroe Auto Equipment Co., 470 F.2d 1329, 1333 (5th Cir. 1972), cert. denied 412 U.S. 928 (1973)).

(6) The SEIU, by its agents, widely disseminated to employees these threats, including but not limited to the SEIU's threat that Kaiser had "confirmed that NUHW members at Kaiser are not automatically eligible to receive Performance Sharing Program (PSP) bonuses" and that employees would not get such bargained-for bonuses if NUHW won.

1. Facts

a. Unfair Labor Practices in the Southern California Professional Units

In 1995, labor organizations representing various units of Kaiser Permanente employees formed a Coalition of Kaiser Permanente Unions (the Coalition). The Coalition was comprised of local and international unions representing Kaiser Permanente employees in defined geographic regions and existed for the purpose of facilitating collective bargaining with Kaiser Permanente entities.⁸ The Coalition's rules and bylaws determine eligibility for membership. In

5

20

25

30

35

40

45

50

pertinent part, the Coalition bars from membership labor organization that obtain representative status by "raiding" a unit of a Coalition member.

In 1996, Kaiser Permanente and the Coalition entered into a national labor management partnership agreement (the LMP). Thereafter, local, regional, and national negotiations were conducted under auspices of the LMP. The negotiations resulted in successive national collective-bargaining agreements between Kaiser Permanente and SEIU-UHW, the penultimate of which was effective by its terms from October 1, 2005 through September 30, 2010 (the national agreement), followed by the current agreement effective October 1 through September 30, 2012. SEIU-UHW and the Employers have been parties to seriatim local agreements covering the MSW unit, effective October 1, 2005 through September 30, 2010 and October 1, 2010, through September 30, 2013, each of which was integrated with the relevant national agreement to provide for a basic wage structure and a variety of fringe benefits, including provisions for tuition reimbursement, PSP bonuses, and across-the-board wage increases.

The LMP provided, inter alia, a performance sharing plan (the PSP). The stated purpose of the PSP was to recognize the value of national agreement-covered employees' contributions to Kaiser Permanente by permitting them to share in the company's performance gains. The PSP was, in short, a bonus incentive program, the amounts of which were annually agreed upon between the Coalition and Kaiser Permanente. Historically, the PSP was calculated in January and February based on performance in the preceding year and paid to employees in March.¹⁰

In 2007, following a merger of labor organizations, SEIU-UHW became the recognized representative for three professional collective bargaining units in Southern California—the Health Care Professionals unit, the Psych-Social Chapter unit, and the American Federation of Nurses unit (the SoCal-pro units)—comprised within the workforces of Southern California Permanente Medical Group and Kaiser Foundation Hospitals (collectively, the SoCal-pro

⁸ Not all unions representing Kaiser employees participate in the Coalition.

⁹ Raiding is an attempt by one union to obtain collective-bargaining rights over a unit of employees already represented by another union.

¹⁰ Non-Coalition negotiated contracts may contain bonus incentive programs, but they do not necessarily have the same terms as, and are not designated as, a PSP program.

employers). 11 One of the Employers herein—Kaiser Foundation Hospitals—is also one of the SoCal-pro employers.

SEIU-UHW and the SoCal-pro employers were, at all material times, parties to the national agreement as well as a local CBA covering each of the SoCal-pro units. The interrelated national and local CBAs provided for basic wage structures and a variety of fringe benefits, including provisions for tuition reimbursement, paid time-off for stewards to attend union-sponsored steward training sessions, PSP bonuses, and across-the-board wage increases. In 2008, an agreement among the parties to these agreements provided for acrossthe-board wage adjustments for, inter alia, employees in the SoCal-pro units, in the pay periods 10 closest to October 1, 2008 and 2009 as well as a further adjustment of two percent to be effective in the pay period closest to April 1. The PSP bonus provisions of the national agreement applied to each of the SoCal-pro units.

In late January 2009, certain former SEIU-UHW officers and professional organizers formed NUHW and commenced raiding units represented by SEIU-UHW. On February 27, 2009, NUHW filed representation petitions with the Board seeking certification as the collective bargaining representative for the SoCal-pro units.

20 On February 3, the Board certified NUHW as the exclusive bargaining representative of the SoCal-pro units, and the SoCal-pro employers and NUHW commenced bargaining. At the initial bargaining meeting, NUHW requested that the SoCal-pro employers continue in effect until October 1 the terms of its agreements with SEIU-UHW. At a bargaining meeting held February 26, Kaiser's representatives told NUHW representatives that the SoCal-pro employers would not continue the terms of the agreements with SEIU-UHW, that the employees would not 25 receive the two percent pay increase that had been negotiated in 2008, that the employees would not receive further tuition reimbursements, and that the NUHW stewards would not receive paid time off for steward training. Thereafter, the following sequence of events occurred:

30

35

40

5

15

March -- Employees in the SoCal-pro units received the PSP bonuses based on calculations of Kaiser's 2009 performance.

March 18 - At the March 18 bargaining session, the SoCal-pro employers presented NUHW negotiators with a letter stating that participation in the Coalition was a precondition to applying agreement terms to the NUHW-represented units, a participation NUHW would be unlikely ever to realize.

March 30 - NUHW filed ULP charges against the SoCal-pro employers in Case 21-CA-39296 (ULP charges), alleging that by unilaterally withholding certain benefits from employees in the Southern California pro units, the SoCal-pro employers had violated Section 8(a)(5) and (1) of the Act.

April - The SoCal-pro employers refused to pay the SoCal-pro unit employees the contractually projected two percent April adjustment. Kaiser paid the adjustment to employees in the Kaiser service and technical employees throughout California (the statewide unit) represented by the Intervenor.

End May - Negotiations on the national agreement concluded. June 14 through June 23 – National agreement ratified.

June 29 - NUHW filed the instant representation petition, 32-RC-5774, beginning the critical period.

50

¹¹ The Southern California pro units are separate and distinct from the MSW unit.

<u>June 29</u> – NUHW also filed a representation petition in 32-RC-5775, seeking to represent the statewide unit.

5

10

15

20

25

30

35

40

45

50

<u>August 27</u> – Based on the ULP charges, the Regional Director issued a complaint and notice of hearing against the SoCal-pro employers.

<u>September 13 to October 4</u> – the Regional Director conducted the mail ballot election among employees in the statewide unit.

October 18 - November 8 - the Regional Director conducted the mail ballot election among employees in the MSW Unit.

October 4 – Region 21 in Los Angeles filed with the U.S. Central District Court a petition for temporary injunction against the SoCal-pro employers seeking to enjoin the commission of ULPs in the SoCal pro units.

October 6 —Ballots in the statewide unit election tallied: NUHW--11,364; SEIU-UHW -- 18,290.

October 10 -Ballots in the MSW unit tallied: NUHW--139; SEIU-UHW --148.

October 18 and 19 – Judge Schmidt opened hearing on the ULP charges.

December 13 – Judge Schmidt issued decision on the ULP charges, finding that the SoCal-pro employers violated Section 8(a)(5) and (1) of the Act by unilaterally withholding an April 2010 wage increase, tuition reimbursement for continuing education courses, and paid steward-training time-off from employees in the SoCal-pro units (Kaiser's ULPs). 12

March 3, 2011—The Board, in the absence of exceptions, with a minor unit-description modification, adopted Judge Schmidt's findings and conclusions at Southern California Permanente Medical Group; and Kaiser Foundation Hospitals, 356 NLRB No.106 (2011)

b. Intervenor's Campaign in the MSW Unit

During the critical period, the Intervenor widely disseminated throughout the MSW unit written campaign materials. Many of these materials referred, explicitly and implicitly, to the Kaiser ULPs detailed in Judge Schmidt's decision, as well as to prospective nonpayment of the PSP incentive bonus. The following statements are representative excerpts from the Intervenor's campaign materials disseminated widely during the critical period:

- NUHW has filed a petition to take away our union and our [new] contract. No matter
 what they try to tell us, the bottom line is: Their petition threatens to wipe away...our
 raises, healthcare, pensions, and job security. We would have to re-bargain our entire
 contract.
- Southern California Kaiser pros who voted for NUHW in January still don't have the 2% pay raises that SEIU-UHW members got in April...[quoting a statewide-unit member]: "NUHW can't even get the 2% raise that we've seen in our paychecks for three months now."
- If [NUHW replaces SEIU-UHW as our union] our new contract and everything in it is gone and has to be re-bargained...In January, Kaiser Healthcare Professionals in So Cal voted to join NUHW and they lost their contract, the 2% raise that SEIU-UHW members got in April, continuing education reimbursements, and more.
- [Quoting an MSW unit member]: "To date, because the S. CA Professionals voted for NUHW, they are now at least 5% behind us in raises."

¹² Nonpayment of PSP bonuses was not an issue in the March 30 ULP charges.

- [Quoting an SEIU-UHW member]: "We get a total of 9% in raises over the next three years while NUHW is scratching and clawing to get their members in So CA the 2% raise that we got in April. We have no changes to our benefits while NUHW's benefits are up for grabs...If you look at the facts, it's obvious: Win with SEIU-UHW or lose with NUHW."
- The National Agreement applies only to the unions in the Coalition (32 unions including SEIU bargaining the National Agreement)...If a bargaining unit is not represented by a
- Coalition Union, then the provisions of this National Agreement will not apply. NUHW is not a part of the Coalition, and thus employees represented by NUHW will not be covered by the National Agreement.
- 15 While SEIU-UHW members have enjoyed the benefits of their 2% April raise for five months, NUHW members at Kaiser are going to trial to try and get the raise—a process that will likely take years with no guarantee they will be successful. Worse, the Southern California professionals who switched to NUHW are reporting being told by Kaiser that they will not be getting the 3% raise that all SEIU-UHW members will receive in October. 20 That means in 10 months under NUHW, the Southern RNs and Pros will be 5% behind SEIU-UHW members on their raises—and facing the loss of their PSP bonuses.
 - Two Approaches to Raises at Kaiser The SEIU-UHW way: One simple step
 - A. Vote for SEIU-UHW and get all the raises in your contract—guaranteed, on time and without going to court.

The NUHW Way: Years of legal fights

- A. File charges with the NLRB
- B. Six months later go to a trial
- C. Wait months for the judge to make a decision and hope the judge decides for you not against you
 - D. The decision gets appealed to the NLRB in Washington D.C.
 - E. A year later the NLRB issues a decision, which could be for or against you
- F. That decision is appealed in federal court, which could rule for or against you, and ultimately could go the U.S. Supreme Court.
- G. Several years later the case could be resolved with no guarantee of ever getting the raise.
- [From a flyer showing the photographs of five S. CA professionals] In NUHW, we lost our raises and guaranteed PSP Bonus. Don't make the same mistake we did.... [Quoting pictured employees of the SoCal-pro units]:
- o "It was bad enough that giving up our SEIU-UHW contract meant we lost the 2% raise we were supposed to get in June. But now we're also losing our PSP Bonus."
- o "When I counted up everything I've lost since my co-workers switched to NUHW-the PSP and the raises for the next three years—I estimate it adds up to about \$20,000. That's a huge step backwards for my co-workers and me."
- [Quote from Cleante Stain (Stain), an employee in the psych-social SoCal-pro unit]: "We bet our future on NUHW, and we lost big. It was a mistake to put our raises and PSP at risk. I urge you not to take the same chance we did."

50

5

10

25

30

35

40

- In January 2010, Kaiser Healthcare Professions in So Cal voted to join NUHW and they lost their contract, the 2% raise that SEIU-UHW members got in April, Continuing Education reimbursements and more.
- With NUHW, we'd have to start bargaining all over again, just like the Kaiser pros in Southern California who voted for NUHW in January...here's what the Kaiser pros already lost with NUHW:

LOST RAISES: NUHW is in an ugly legal battle with Kaiser over the 2% raises SEIU-UHW members got in April but they didn't.

LOST CEU'S: Continuing Education Units no longer reimbursed.

5

10

15

20

25

30

35

40

45

50

- [Quoting an MSW unit member]: "I used my last PSP bonus to confirm a trip reservation to Alaska. I know co-workers who have used theirs to pay off credit cards. This is a significant amount of money, and I don't understand why NUHW wants us to take the risk of losing it."
- On a conference call with Kaiser employees August 3, Kaiser Southern California President Ben Chu confirmed that NUHW members at Kaiser are not automatically eligible to receive Performance Sharing Program (PSP) bonuses. The PSP adds thousands of dollars to Kaiser workers' income each year...Chu made it clear that only members of unions in the Coalition of Kaiser Permanente Unions-like SEIU-UHW-are guaranteed the bonus as part of the national agreement we just approved by an overwhelming majority. NUHW could try to negotiate a bonus, but they are unlikely to succeed because it is a function of the Partnership and Coalition which they are not a part of. No Kaiser union outside the Coalition or national contract gets the PSP bonus.
- [Quoting a SoCal-pro unit member]: "It's bad enough that we lost our 2% raise in April and our continuing education reimbursements. Now we just found out that we're losing our PSP bonuses too. It keeps getting worse with NUHW."

During the critical period, the Intervenor utilized the services of Cleante Stain (Stain), a psychiatric social worker employed by Kaiser Permanente in one of its Southern California facilities and a member of the psych-social SoCal-pro unit. As arranged by SEIU-UHW, Stain was present at an SEIU-UHW-sponsored meeting of MSW unit employees in Oakland, attended by as many as 40 employees. It is not clear from Stain's testimony what, specifically, she told the MSW unit employees. Generally, in the course of her visits, Stain told employees the SoCal-pro units did not get their two percent raise after selecting NUHW as their bargaining representative and suggested employees ask themselves it they could afford to live without the two percent. Stain further told employees that selecting NUHW might put at risk the three percent raise scheduled for October and that the SoCal-pro units had been told they would not get the PSP bonus in March because they were not a part of the Coalition. It is reasonable to infer that Stain delivered essentially the same message to the MSW unit employees in Oakland.

¹³ Stain's purported photograph and quotation appears in one of Intervenor's flyers detailed above. The parties stipulated that Stain's testimony taken in an earlier hearing in Case 32-RC-2775 be incorporated herein.

¹⁴ SEIU paid Stain's travel expenses and an amount comparable to her hourly pay rate for the time she expended.

c. Petitioner's Campaign in the MSW unit

During the critical period, Petitioner widely disseminated throughout the MSW unit written campaign materials countering Intervenor's communications. The following are relevant, representative excerpts from Petitioner's campaign materials:

- You can keep contract raises and benefits...the National Labor Relations Board agrees NUHW is right. SEIU hasn't been truthful. On August 27, 2010 the National Labor Relations Board General Counsel took legal action in Case #21-CA-39296 to protect Kaiser Professions who have joined NUHW and are entitled to all of their previously scheduled raises and tuition reimbursements. When we vote NUHW, our contract raises and benefits are protected.
- When the National Labor Relations Board sought an injunction against Kaiser on Oct. 4, they set the record straight. It was against the law for Kaiser to withhold the raises and benefits of workers who voted to join NUHW. When SEIU campaigned for months saying otherwise, they were lying about our rights.
- Last week, NUHW's attorneys filed objections to both Kaiser's and SEIU's conduct in the Service and Tech election. Misconduct included Kaiser illegally withholding raises and threatening to do the same to workers who were voting to join NUHW.
- [Provided web link for employees to read the injunction sought by Region 21] The NLRB says Kaiser broke the law by withholding raises. The NLRB says we get all the raises and benefits of the National Agreement, the local agreements, and the LMP...if we were entitled to it under SEIU, we're entitled to it in NUHW...U.S. District courts and appellate courts defer to the NLRB, and grant almost every request for injunction.
- [NUHW Bulletin story regarding the service and technical unit election] Employees' choice thwarted by delays in NLRB enforcement, false fear campaign by SEIU and employer [resulted in] 11,364 [votes for NUHW and 18,290...for SEIU—and workers are calling for a new election. [Quoting a statewide unit employee]: "Workers can't have a fair vote when they don't know they have the right to choose without being punished for it. SEIU and Kaiser management threatened people's livelihood and the NLRB didn't take action to protect us until it was too late."...Just hours after voting ended, the NLRB exposed SEIU's scare tactic as a lie [when the NLRB filed for injunction].
- In charges filed yesterday by the National Labor Relations Board, the federal government has instructed Kaiser management that all the raises and benefits of workers who vote for NUHW, including our April raise, are guaranteed by law and must be paid...This action by the government...directly contradicts what SEIU has been telling Kaiser workers...for months.
- The Federal Government has filed charges against Kaiser, which will have to pay the professionals with interest and reinstate all of the protections they have withheld.
- NLRB puts it in writing: Raises, PSP, and benefits are all guaranteed by law when we join NUHW.

5

10

15

20

25

30

35

40

• There is no other way to put it. SEIU has been lying to us about our raises and benefits... We all have the right to join NUHW, and when we do our raises and benefits are guaranteed by law.

5

• It's the Law; our PSP is just another benefit that we'll keep when we vote to join NUHW. [Citing *More Truck Lines, Inc.*] The employer must keep everything the same while we negotiate for improvements.

d. NLRB Regional Office Information

10

During the critical period, NLRB regional staff responded to public inquiries about Kaiser elections by reading the following script:

15

In general, an employer' is required to maintain existing contract terms when a new union is selected to represent bargaining unit employees, subject to further bargaining...the Regional Director in Region 21 (Los Angeles)...issued a complaint alleging, among other things, that Kaiser violated the National Labor Relations Act by refusing to grant a wage increase that had been scheduled to go into effect on April 1, 2010...That matter will go to hearing before an administrative law judge if the parties are unable to settle the case.

20

The outcome of every case filed before the NLRB depends on the particular facts applicable to that case. Because every situation may have unique facts, it cannot be stated with certainty what Kaiser's obligation would be if NUHW became the bargaining representative of the unit employees scheduled to vote in the mail ballot representation election that will begin on September 13, 2010.¹⁵

25

C. Discussion

30

35

40

Petitioner's Objection No. 1 asserts, essentially, that the SoCal-pro employers' unlawful conduct toward NUHW-represented employees in the SoCal pro units, in and of itself, interfered with the election. The Board holds that 8(a) violations may, a fortiori, interfere with an election unless the unlawful conduct is so de minimis that it is virtually impossible to conclude the violations could have affected the results of the election. While it is true that one of the Kaiser employers involved in this case engaged in unlawful conduct, as detailed in *Southern California Permanente Medical Group*, supra, the conduct did not occur in the MSW unit but in the SoCal pro units, which are distinct and separate geographically from the MSW unit. Kaiser argues that its earlier conduct in discrete bargaining units cannot be considered objectionable in the MSW unit election, as the conduct was not directed at MSW unit employees. Essentially, Kaiser maintains that conduct affecting one bargaining unit cannot be applied to a separate bargaining unit as a fortiori conduct. There being no authority establishing that conduct in a geographically separate unit can, without more, interfere with an election in another unit, I recommend that Objection No. 1 be overruled.

45

¹⁵ There is no evidence as to how many, if any, MSW unit employees sought election information from the Region.

¹⁶ See Cooking Good Division of Perdue Farms, Inc., 323 NLRB 345 (1997); <u>Pembrook Management</u>, 296 NLRB 1226, 1242 (1989); Airstream, Inc., 304 NLRB 151, 152 (1991). In assessing whether unfair labor practices could have affected the results of the election, the Board considers "the number of violations, their severity, the extent of dissemination, the size of the unit, and other relevant factors." <u>Enola Super Thrift</u>, 233 NLRB 409 (1977).

A determination that Kaiser's ULPs did not, a fortiori, interfere with the MSW-unit election so as to justify setting it aside, does not eliminate Objections Nos. 2, 3, 4, and 6, however. Intervenor's campaign repeatedly correlated Kaiser's ULPs to the MSW unit, emphasizing the benefit risk the unlawful conduct denoted for employees who selected NUHW as their representative. The crucial question, then, is whether by emphasizing and parallelizing Kaiser's ULPs, Intervenor's campaign unfairly interfered with MSW-unit employees' election choice. Also to be considered is whether pronouncements that MSW unit employees would be ineligible for PSP incentive bonuses if they selected NUHW interfered with the election.

10

15

20

25

5

Intervenor argues that its campaign statements during the critical period (1) were neither threatening nor untruthful, but were factual, good-faith statements of potential voting consequences relevant to employees' decisions about union representation; (2) were factual predictions or statements of risk and not "unanswerable threats that employees fear because they know the speaker...can carry them out;" (3) caused no employee fear, which, if any existed, resulted from "employees' own reasoned choices based on all the available information, in a campaign in which each union had the ability to present its version of the facts"; (4) were objective statements about Kaiser's behavior—at worst, misrepresentations or incomplete statements of the law made during a campaign - neither of which are grounds for setting aside the election.

It is true that Intervenor had no control over or involvement in Kaiser's ULPs and that Intervenor could not control Kaiser's future actions regarding MSW unit benefits. As Intervenor points out, its challenged statements were factual recountings of what Kaiser had done in the SoCal-pro units, which, Intervenor represents, were made in good-faith.¹⁷ The accuracy and good-faith of Intervenor's reporting is not, however, dispositive of the issues. The Board applies an objective standard when evaluating whether statements interfere with free election choice, looking neither at motivation nor subjective effect.¹⁸

30

Intervenor points out that at the time it described Kaiser's ULPs to MSW unit employees, Kaiser's actions had not been judicially found to be unlawful. The absence of a judicial pronouncement does not alter the fact that Kaiser's conduct was, at all times critical to the election, unlawful. However factually accurate Intervenor's statements may have been, Intervenor's campaign specifically linked its predictions or risk-warnings to existing and ongoing Kaiser ULPs not to future lawful behavior.

40

45

35

Insofar as Intervenor's campaign focused on Kaiser's conduct in the SoCal-pro units, its objective effect was to warn employees that they jeopardized monetary benefits if they changed representatives. In Intervenor's communications, Kaiser's ULPs figured as concrete, menacing reminders that Kaiser had unilaterally withheld benefits from employees in the SoCal-pro units when they chose to be represented by NUHW. Viewed objectively, Intervenor's statements presented an obvious cause and effect: SoCal-pro units voted for NUHW; Kaiser withdrew certain of their established benefits. Intervenor's communications invited, if not provoked, the obvious inference that Kaiser's conduct would be repeated as to MSW unit benefits if employees voted for Petitioner.

¹⁷ I accept Petitioner's good-faith claim even though its disseminated caution that unit employees could obtain established raises through NUHW only after years of legal fights suggests awareness that Kaiser's conduct was unlawful.

¹⁸ S.T.A.R., Inc., 347 NLRB 82 (2006).

As Intervenor points out, USW unit employees could not reasonably have feared that Intervenor could withhold benefits, and employee fears as to what would happen under NUHW representation may have stemmed from reasoned conclusions based on available facts, facts that Intervenor neither created nor misrepresented but merely disseminated. But the very interconnection of unlawful conduct with campaign rhetoric is the problem here. Intervenor's messages rested on coercive bedrock, i.e., the existence of unremedied ULPs that clearly paralleled the MSW employees' situation. Viewed objectively, the facts—broadcast widely during the critical period—must have signified to MSW unit employees the likelihood that Kaiser would, consistent with continuing misconduct, unlawfully eliminate certain MSW unit benefits if employees chose NUHW. Under those circumstances, the known existence of the facts had, at the very least, the tendency to interfere with employees' freedom of choice.¹⁹

5

10

15

20

25

30

35

40

45

50

Prospective curtailment of PSP incentive bonuses to employees in the SoCal-pro units was not at issue in *Southern California Permanente Medical Group*, supra, but Judge Schmidt's reasoning can be applied to that benefit as well. Employee entitlement to PSP incentive bonuses was the product of the national agreement, as were the benefits Kaiser had unlawfully, unilaterally changed. Judge Schmidt rejected Kaiser's arguments that (1) participation in the Coalition and the LMP was a pre-condition to the application of the national agreement to the SoCal-pro units and (2) that benefits therein were "creatures of the national agreement that ceased to apply when the employees selected a [non-Coalition] bargaining agent, such as the NUHW." Rather, as Judge Schmidt explained, "the terms of each [applicable] agreement as a whole – local, cross-regional, and national – [made] up the terms and conditions of employment encompassed by the statutory duty to bargain under Section 8(a)(5)."

Under Judge Schmidt's reasoning, Kaiser was required to maintain and continue conditions of employment that came into being "by virtue of prior commitment or practice," i.e., the prior commitments memorialized by the terms of the applicable agreements. Although the precise incentive bonus design entitled "Performance Sharing Plan," the payouts of which required an annual agreement between the Coalition and Kaiser, might not have survived a change of bargaining representative, the granting of incentive bonuses constituted a term and condition of employment that Kaiser was required to maintain and continue in substance if not in specific form, unless altered through collective bargaining.

Intervenor's widely disseminated warnings that PSP incentive bonuses could be lost if employees selected NUHW were erroneous since Kaiser's practice of granting incentive bonuses was subject to change only through collective bargaining. Further, Intervenor was joined in its warnings by Kaiser's President Chu, who informed employees that only members of coalition unions were guaranteed PSP incentive bonuses. Intervenor widely disseminated Chu's statement, giving weight to Intervenor's repeated forewarnings that representational change might endanger PSP incentive bonuses. In these circumstances, widely disseminated warnings that PSP incentive bonuses would not survive a change of representative must also have tended to interfere with employees' freedom of choice.

Employers and SEIU-UHW argue that both unions actively campaigned and had ample

¹⁹ See *Taylor Wharton*, supra and *Vegas Village Shopping Corporation*, 229 NLRB 279, 280 (1977) (employer's unlawful conduct among one unit of employees in a metropolitan area "would tend to discourage all employees in the...area from voting for the same Union which was on the ballot for both units" and have a coercive impact on the employees in both units.

²⁰ Alpha Cellulose Corp., 265 NLRB 177, 178 fn. 1 (1982), enfd. mem. 718 F.2d 1088 (4th Cir. 1983).

opportunity to urge their respective merits on the voters and to promulgate their respective messages in the campaign. Employers argue that Petitioner's extensive counteractive campaign, as well as the Region's well-publicized Complaint and Notice of Hearing and court injunction filings, gave voters sufficient information to permit a free and uncoerced choice in the election. It is true Petitioner informed voters of all relevant Board proceedings, repeatedly accused Intervenor of lying, and assured unit employees that Kaiser's benefit withdrawals could not lawfully be repeated. While the Board's legal proceedings against Kaiser weighted Petitioner's assurances, since Kaiser actively disputed the charges, employees must have realized that only litigation would resolve the issues. Indeed, one of Intervenor's handouts emphasized that if unit employees chose Petitioner, they would receive established raises only through "The NUHW Way: [after] Years of legal fights." The timeline of legal proceedings tended to affirm Intervenor's caution: although complaint issued on August 27, the ULP hearing did not open until October 18, the day balloting commenced, and initial decision would not issue for nearly two months. Petitioner's counter-campaign could not, when weighed against pending litigation of indeterminate outcome and unremedied ULPs, be reasonably expected to persuade voters that Intervenor's warnings were mere campaign propaganda. The unavoidable inference to be drawn from these circumstances is that MSW unit employees voted with objectively reasonable, albeit inaccurate and ULP-induced, apprehensions that a vote for Petitioner was a vote for benefit reduction.

20

5

10

15

Intervenor's widely disseminated, consistent warnings that Kaiser was likely to repeat its 2009 unlawful conduct in the MSW unit if unit employees selected Petitioner as their collective-bargaining representative tended to stoke unwarranted and coerced voter fears. Given Intervenor's relatively small margin of victory, Intervenor's conduct, viewed objectively, had a reasonable tendency to interfere with unit employees' free and uncoerced choice in the election. Accordingly, I recommend that Objections Nos. 2, 3, 4, and 6, in the circumstances described by Objection No. 1, be sustained.

RECOMMENDATION

30

35

25

Based on the above, I recommend that Objections Nos. 2, 3, 4, and 6 be sustained and that Objection No. 1 be overruled. Accordingly, I recommend that the Board election in Case 32-RC-5774 be set aside and a new election be held.²¹ Inasmuch as I have recommended that Objections Nos. 2, 3, 4, and 6 be sustained, I recommend that the mail ballot election held in Case No. 32-RC-5774 be set aside and that the representation proceeding be remanded to the Regional Director of Region 32 for the purpose of conducting a second election.

Further, and in accordance with *Lufkin Rule Co.*, and *Fieldcrest Cannon, Inc.*, 327 NLRB 109 FN 3 (1998), I recommend that the following notice be issued in the Notice of Second Election in Case No. 32-RC-5774:

45

50

²¹ Pursuant to the provisions of Section 102.69 of the Board's Rules and Regulations, Series 8, as amended, within 14 days from the date of issuance of this Recommended Decision, either party may file with the Board in Washington D.C. an original and eight copies of exceptions thereto. Immediately upon the filing of such exceptions, the party filing same shall serve a copy thereof upon the other parties and shall file a copy with the Regional Director. If no exceptions are filed thereto, the Board may adopt this Recommended Decision.

NOTICE TO ALL VOTERS

The mail ballot election held between October 18 and November 8 was set aside because the National Labor Relations Board found that certain conduct of SEIU-UHW-West in the circumstances of unfair labor practices committed by Kaiser Foundation Hospitals and Southern California Permanente Medical Group among three professional collective bargaining units of Kaiser employees in Southern California interfered with the exercise of a free and reasoned choice among employees in the following unit:

All full-time and regular part-time medical social workers employed by the Employers in positions covered by the collective bargaining agreement between the Employers and SEIU-UHW effective October 1, 2005, including Medical Social Worker I, Medical Social Worker II, and Medical Social Worker III; excluding any medical social worker assigned to be Director of Social Services at any of the Employers' facilities or to whom the Employers have given the authority to hire, promote, discipline, discharge, or otherwise change status or to effectively recommend such action, all employees represented by other unions, confidential employees, guards, and supervisors as defined in the National Labor Relations Act.

Therefore, a new election will be held in accordance with the terms of this notice of election. All eligible voters should understand that the National labor Relations Act, as amended, gives them the right to cast their ballots as they see fit and protects them in the exercise of this right, free from interference by any of the parties.²²

Dated at Washington, DC: July 19, 2011

Lana H. Parke Administrative Law Judge

hua V. Sacke

35

25

30

5

40

Under the provisions of Sec. 102.69 of the Board's Rules and Regulations, exceptions to this Report may be filed with the Board in Washington, DC within 14 days from the date of issuance of this Report and recommendations. Exceptions must be received by the Board in Washington by August 2, 2011.

PROOF OF SERVICE 1 (CCP 1013) 2 I am a citizen of the United States and an employee in the County of Alameda, State of 3 California. I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within action; my business 4 address is 1001 Marina Village Parkway, Suite 200, Alameda, California 94501-1091. On August 5 18, 2011, I served upon the following parties in this action: 6 7 Florice Hoffman William Baudler Law Offices of Florice Hoffman Regional Director 8502 East Chapman, Suite 353 8 Orange, CA 92869 NLRB, Region 32 fhoffman@socal.rr.com 9 1301 Clay Street, Room 300N Oakland, CA 94612-5211 10 William.Baudler@nlrb.gov Michael R. Lindsay 11 Ronald E. Goldman Nixon Peabody LLP Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc. Gas Company Tower 12 One Kaiser Plaza. 555 West Fifth Street Legal Department, 19th Floor 13 Los Angeles, CA 90013 Oakland, CA 94612 mlindsay@nixonpeabody.com Ronald.Goldman@kp.org 14 copies of the document(s) described as: 15 16 SEIU-UHW – WEST'S EXCEPTIONS TO THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON OBJECTIONS; AND SEIU-17 UHW - WEST'S BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF EXCEPTIONS TO THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON 18 **OBJECTIONS** 19 [X]**BY MAIL** I placed a true copy of each document listed herein in a sealed envelope. 20 addressed as indicated herein, and caused each such envelope, with postage thereon fully prepaid, to be placed in the United States mail at Alameda, California. I am readily familiar 21 with the practice of Weinberg, Roger & Rosenfeld for collection and processing of correspondence for mailing, said practice being that in the ordinary course of business, mail 22 is deposited in the United States Postal Service the same day as it is placed for collection. 23 BY EMAIL I caused to be transmitted each document listed herein via the email address(es) listed above or on the attached service list. 24 I certify under penalty of perjury that the above is true and correct. Executed at Alameda, 25 California, on August 18, 2011. 26 27 Rhonda Fortier-Bourne

28
WEINBERG, ROGER &
ROSENFELD
A Professional Corporation
1001 Marina Village Parkway
Suite 200
Alameda. CA 94501-1091
510 337 1001

125039/633350